

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1-19 were previously canceled. Claims 21-25, 31 and 32 have been amended, and claim 20 is canceled. These amendments are made without prejudice to presentation of the original claims in a continuing application. Claims 34-50 are newly presented.

Claim 20 has been canceled and rewritten as new independent claim 34. Support for claim 34 is provided throughout the specification and the figures, for example, page 3, lines 11-24 and Figures 2, 4 and 6. Similar support is also provided for the amendments to claim 31. Claim 32 has been amended to strike the duplicate structures recited in claim 31. Support for claims 34-50 is provided throughout the specification, the claims, and the figures, for example, page 3, lines 11-24, claims 20-33, and Figures 2, 4 and 6.

The specification on page 1 has been amended to update the cross reference to the related application. Paragraph [0002] of the specification has also been amended to provide the serial number and patent number.

No new matter is entered by any of these amendments.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants dispute the Office Action's assertions on this issue as inapplicable to the claims, especially in view of the amendments. The Office Action, for example, alleges that claim 20 is indefinite because "said mold material" could be understood to mean two completely different things. Claim 20 has been canceled and rewritten as claim 34, which does not recite the phrase "said mold material". Likewise, claims 21-30, which depend on claim 34, also do not recite the phrase "said mold material". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 20-22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,574,554 to Su et al. ("the Su patent"). Applicants traverse the rejection because the Su patent fails to disclose every element of the claimed subject matter.

The standard for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is one of strict identity. An anticipation rejection requires that each limitation of a claim be found in a single reference, *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 224 U.S.P.Q. 409, 411 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Su patent does not satisfy this standard. For example, the Su patent fails to teach Applicant's first mold portion having a concave optical surface, an edge and a first flange. In contrast, the Su patent discloses a first mold member (1) having a concave surface (7), an outer rim portion (6) and an outwardly-extending annular member (34) forming a lower surface (35). Applicants respectively assert that the outer rim portion (6) and the outwardly-extending annular member (34) are quite different than the edge and flange elements of the first mold portion of their claimed mold. Also, the Su patent fails to teach Applicants' overflow collector for accumulating overflow reactive material, and specifically fails to teach an overflow collector capable of reducing the surface area of the overflow reactive mixture in contact with an ambient or inert environment (See e.g., Su patent Figures 8-15). Because the Su patent fails to disclose every element of the claimed molds, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 20, 24-27 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,271,875 to Appleton et al. ("the Appleton patent"). Applicants traverse the rejection because the Appleton patent fails to disclose every claim element. For example, the Appleton patent fails to teach Applicants' mold having a gap situated between the flanges, the gap being open to an ambient or inert environment. In stark contrast, the mold of Appleton is closed to the environment. Because the Appleton patent fails to teach every element of the claimed molds, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,071,111 to Doke et al. ("the Doke patent"). Applicants traverse the rejection because the Doke patent fails to disclose every element of the claims. For example, the Doke patent fails to teach Applicants' mold having a gap situated between the first and second flanges of the first and second mold portions, respectively. In contrast, the mold of Doke (Figure 18) provides a outward flange (22) that is separate from either the upper or lower mold half. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

DOCKET NO.: VTN-0577
Application No.: 10/074,132
Office Action Dated: July 14, 2003

PATENT

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 23 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Su patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Su patent does not teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. Claim 23 and 28 each depend on claim 34, and for the reasons stated above, the Su patent does not disclose, teach or suggest a mold of the type presently claimed in which a first mold portion has a concave optical surface, an edge and a first flange. Since at least this claim element is not taught or suggested by the Su patent, this rejection for alleged obviousness is improper and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusions

Applicants request the Examiner to:

- (1) enter the amendments to claims 21-25, 31 and 32, add new claims 34-50, and cancel claim 20;
- (2) reconsider and withdraw the standing rejections of the claims; and
- (3) pass claims 21-50 to allowance.

If the Examiner is of a contrary view, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (215) 557-5984.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey H. Rosedale
Registration No. 46,018

Date: October 14, 2003

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439